Lower limit on decoherence introduced by entangling two spatially-separated qubits

A.J. Fisher*
Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University College London,
Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, U.K.

It is shown that a generalization of the fluctuation-dissipation theorem places an upper bound on the figure of merit for any quantum gate designed to entangle spatially-separated qubits. The bound depends solely on the spectral properties of the environment. The bound applies even to systems performing a quantum computation within a decoherence-free subspace, but might be optimized by the use of non-equilibrium squeezed states of the environment, or by using an environment system constructed to have response confined to certain frequencies.

arXiv:quant-ph/0211200v1 29 Nov 2002

Many possible systems to realise the ultimate goal of quantum computation [1] have been proposed in recent years. In choosing systems, one has to trade off two competing requirements: one would like to be able to manipulate the state of the quantum bits (qubits) rapidly, in order to be able to perform the computation as quickly as possible. On the other hand, it is important to avoid decoherence. Typically, qubits which interact relatively strongly with their surroundings can be manipulated more rapidly than those that do not, but also decohere more rapidly; qubits based on excitons in quantum dots [2, 3], or on nuclear spins [4, 5], provide examples of the fast and slow extremes respectively. In many cases the important quantity is the ratio of the decoherence time to the characteristic manipulation time, often referred to as the 'figure of merit'.

In this paper we make precise the connection between the rate at which two spatially separated qubits can be entangled, and the minimum amount of decoherence that is necessary to accomplish this, thereby placing an upper bound on the figure of merit. This connection is inevitable because spatially separated systems cannot be coupled directly; instead, any coupling between them must be mediated by some third system (the environment). For two atoms in a vacuum the environment is the electromagnetic field; for qubits in a solid it might instead be the phonons or conduction electrons. The capacity of the environment to change state in response to one qubit, and the subsequent effect of this change on the other qubit, is what produces the coupling and leads to entanglement of the qubits; yet it also leads to the qubits and the environment becoming entangled, and hence to the decoherence of the qubits. (There may also be additional sources of decoherence, not related to the coupling.) It is worth noting from the outset that in order to make this connection quantitative, it is essential to go beyond Markovian formulations of decoherence, such as that of Lindblad [6], because they take no account of the history of the environment. Therefore, they cannot represent the 'feedback' of the environment on the system that is the essential feature of the communication between the qubits.

Consider two systems, A and B, that encode the quantum information. Suppose they are not coupled directly, but only indirectly via their mutual coupling to an environment E:

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B + \hat{H}_E + \lambda(\hat{H}_{EA} + \hat{H}_{EB}). \qquad (1)$$

We assume the Hamiltonian is time-independent; our argument can be generalized to the case where A and B are driven by a time-dependent external (classical) field. Let us write the coupling Hamiltonian for the A system to the environment as

$$\hat{H}_{EA} = \hat{V}_A \otimes \hat{O}_A, \qquad (2)$$

where $\hat{V}_A$ is a Hermitian system A operator and O_A is a system E operator, and correspondingly for system B. (The most general form for the coupling is a sum of different terms of this type, but our discussion may be easily generalized to that case.)

Suppose the initial ($t = 0$) density matrix for the system consists of a direct product of some (possibly mixed) state of A and B with a (possibly mixed) state of the environment E. We assume that this state of E is a thermal equilibrium distribution, so we can write

$$\hat{\rho}(0) = \rho_{AB}(0) \otimes \frac{\exp(-\beta \hat{H}_E)}{Z_E}, \qquad (3)$$

where $\beta = 1/k_B T$ and Z_E is the environment's partition function. Then, treating the coupling $\lambda(\hat{H}_{EA} + \hat{H}_{EB})$ as the perturbation and working in the interaction representation, the reduced density matrix ρ_{AB} of the AB system evolves as

$$\hat{\rho}_{AB}(t) = \hat{\rho}_{AB}(0) + \Delta\hat{\rho}^{(1)}_{AB}(t) + \Delta\hat{\rho}^{(2)}_{AB}(t) + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^3). \qquad (4)$$

The first-order term $\Delta\hat{\rho}^{(1)}_{AB}$ is given by

$$\Delta\hat{\rho}^{(1)}_{AB}(t) = -\mathrm{i}\lambda \int_0^t \mathrm{d}t' \left[\langle \hat{O}_A \rangle \hat{V}_A(t')\hat{\rho}(0) + \langle \hat{O}_B \rangle \hat{V}_B(t')\hat{\rho}(0) \right] + \text{h.c.}, \qquad (5)$$

where the angle brackets $\langle \ldots \rangle$ correspond to the equilibrium average in the isolated environment. We keep

*Electronic address: andrew.fisher@ucl.ac.uk; URL: `http://www.cmmp.ucl.ac.uk/~ajf`

$\hbar = 1$ throughout. Equation (5) simply corresponds to the evolution of the AB system in the static 'applied field' of the environment. This evolution could equally well have been absorbed into that generated by $\hat{H}_A$ and $\hat{H}_B$ and leads neither to entanglement between A and B nor to decoherence (provided that any external fields entering $\hat{H}_A$ and $\hat{H}_B$ are sufficiently 'classical' [7]). We will henceforth assume that $\langle \hat{O}_A \rangle = \langle \hat{O}_B \rangle = 0$, and neglect this $\mathrm{O}(\lambda)$ term.

To second order, we obtain

$$\Delta\rho^{(2)}(t) = \sum_{ab} \lambda^2 \Bigg[\int_0^t \mathrm{d}t' \int_0^t \mathrm{d}t'' \hat{V}_a(t')\hat{\rho}_{AB}(0)\hat{V}_b(t'')C_{ba}(t''-t') - \int_0^t \mathrm{d}t' \int_{t'}^t \mathrm{d}t'' \left\{ \hat{V}_a(t'')V_b(t')\hat{\rho}_{AB}(0)C_{ab}(t''-t') + \text{h.c.} \right\} \Bigg]. \quad (6)$$

The indices $\{a, b\}$ both run over A and B, and the environmental correlation functions $C_{ab}(t)$ are defined as $C_{ab}(t) \equiv \langle \hat{O}_a(t)\hat{O}_b(0)\rangle = \langle \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\hat{H}_E t}\hat{O}_a \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\hat{H}_E t}\hat{O}_b\rangle$. The contribution to $\hat{\rho}_{AB}$ in equation (6) is much more interesting, as the cross terms involving A and B can entangle the A and B systems. However, these second-order contributions also inevitably decohere the AB system, as we shall see.

We now consider a specific example in which A and B are single spin-1/2 qubits. We suppose that each spin experiences an associated classical magnetic field:

$$\hat{H}_A = -\gamma \mathbf{B}_A \cdot \hat{\sigma}^A, \qquad \hat{H}_B = -\gamma \mathbf{B}_B \cdot \hat{\sigma}^B. \quad (7)$$

We define ω_0 to be the single-spin-flip energy in this external field: $\omega_0 \equiv 2\gamma|\mathbf{B}|$. Initially we shall suppose that the applied field is in the positive z-direction. We further suppose that the effect of the interaction with the environment is to produce spin-flips; i.e., we choose

$$\hat{V}_A = \hat{\sigma}_x^A; \qquad \hat{V}_B = \hat{\sigma}_x^B. \quad (8)$$

Note with this choice the coupling to the environment is perpendicular to the applied field; this will lead to a T_1-type relaxation of the spins. Other choices of coupling (including more realistic ones and those that would lead to T_2-type relaxation) are possible, but do not change the essential features of the result. However, we leave the form of the environment itself completely general at this stage. Re-writing the perturbation in terms of the raising and lowering operators ($\hat{\sigma}_x(t) = \hat{\sigma}_+ \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega_0 t} + \hat{\sigma}_- \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\omega_0 t}$) and introducing two new indices s and s' which run over + and -, we can perform the time integrals to obtain

$$\Delta\hat{\rho}_{AB}^{(2)}(t) = \sum_{ab}\sum_{s,s'} \lambda^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{2\pi} J_{ab}(\omega) \times \Bigg[\hat{\sigma}_s^b \hat{\rho}_{AB}(0)\hat{\sigma}_{s'}^a \psi_{s,s'}(t,\omega) - \left\{ \hat{\sigma}_{s'}^a \hat{\sigma}_s^b \rho_{AB}(0)\phi_{s,s'}(t,\omega) + \text{h.c.} \right\} \Bigg]. \quad (9)$$

Here the power spectrum $J_{ab}(\omega)$ is the Fourier transform of the corresponding correlation function

$$J_{ab}(\omega) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}t C_{ab}(t)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\omega t}, \quad (10)$$

and the quantities ψ and ϕ arise from the time integrals:

$$\psi_{ss'}(t,\omega) \equiv \int_0^t \mathrm{d}t' \int_0^t \mathrm{d}t'' \mathrm{e}^{[-\mathrm{i}\omega_0(st'+s't'')-\mathrm{i}\omega(t''-t')]};$$
$$\phi_{ss'}(t,\omega) \equiv \int_0^t \mathrm{d}t' \int_{t'}^t \mathrm{d}t'' \mathrm{e}^{[-\mathrm{i}\omega_0(st'+s't'')-\mathrm{i}\omega(t''-t')]}. \quad (11)$$

Continuous spectrum. We first of all treat the case of a continuous spectrum $J_{ab}(\omega)$ (i.e., one in which J does not vary significantly over a frequency range $\sim t^{-1}$). For times that are long in comparison with the characteristic inverse frequencies of the environment (but still short compared with the characteristic motions of the qubits, so that the second-order expansion in λ is adequate), the contributions from ϕ and ψ with $s = s'$ are vanishingly small and we may approximate

$$\psi_{s,-s}(t,\omega) \approx \frac{-\mathrm{i}t}{(\omega - s\omega_0)} + \pi t \delta(\omega - s\omega_0);$$
$$\psi_{s,-s}(t,\omega) \approx 2\pi t \delta(\omega - s\omega_0). \quad (12)$$

The second-order result then simplifies to

$$\Delta\hat{\rho}_{AB}^{(2)}(t) = \Delta\rho_{+-} + \Delta\rho_{-+}, \quad (13)$$

where the subscripts refer to the values of s, s' giving rise to the contributions, and

$$\Delta\rho_{s,-s} = \lambda^2 t \sum_{ab} \Bigg[\Big\{ \hat{\sigma}_s^b \hat{\rho}(0)\hat{\sigma}_{-s}^a - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\sigma}_{-s}^a \hat{\sigma}_s^b \hat{\rho}(0) - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\rho}(0)\hat{\sigma}_{-s}^a \hat{\sigma}_s^b \Big\} J_{ab}(s\omega_0) - \mathrm{i}\int \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{2\pi} \frac{J_{ab}(\omega)}{\omega - s\omega_0} \left\{ \hat{\sigma}_{-s}^a \hat{\sigma}_s^b \hat{\rho}(0) - \hat{\rho}(0)\hat{\sigma}_{-s}^a \hat{\sigma}_s^b \right\} \quad (14)$$

This can be rewritten in the effective Lindblad form [6]

$$\Delta\hat{\rho}_{AB} = t\Bigg\{ -\mathrm{i}[\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}, \hat{\rho}_{AB}] + \sum_{\mu} \left(\hat{L}_\mu \hat{\rho}_{AB} \hat{L}_\mu^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{\hat{L}_\mu^\dagger \hat{L}_\mu, \rho_{AB}\} \right) \Bigg\}, \quad (15)$$

where the components of the effective Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \hat{H}_{-+} + \hat{H}_{+-}$ are

$$\hat{H}_{+-} = \lambda^2 \sum_{ab} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{2\pi} \frac{J_{ab}(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_0)} \hat{\sigma}_-^a \hat{\sigma}_+^b$$
$$\hat{H}_{-+} = \lambda^2 \sum_{ab} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{2\pi} J_{ab}(\omega) \frac{1}{(\omega + \omega_0)} \hat{\sigma}_+^a \hat{\sigma}_-^b$$
$$= -\lambda^2 \sum_{ab} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{2\pi} \frac{J_{ab}(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_0)} \mathrm{e}^{-\beta\omega} \hat{\sigma}_+^b \hat{\sigma}_-^a. \quad (16)$$

Provided the $J_{AB} \neq 0$ (i.e. provided that the fluctuations experienced by A and B are correlated), $\hat{H}_{\rm eff}$ can produce entanglement between A and B, as desired. But there are also four Lindblad operators L_μ, two for positive frequencies (linear combinations of $\hat{\sigma}_+^{a,b}$, corresponding to correlated spin flips in the direction of the field) and two for negative frequencies (linear combinations of $\hat{\sigma}_-^{a,b}$, correlated spin flips opposite to the field). The combinations are those that diagonalize the quadratic forms

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_\mu L_{\mu,+}^\dagger L_{\mu,+} &= \lambda^2 \sum_{ab} J_{ab}(\omega_0)\hat{\sigma}_-^a\hat{\sigma}_+^b \\ \sum_\mu L_{\mu,-}^\dagger L_{\mu,-} &= \lambda^2 \sum_{ab} J_{ab}(-\omega_0)\hat{\sigma}_+^a\hat{\sigma}_-^b \\ &= \mathrm{e}^{-\beta\omega_0}\lambda^2 \sum_{ab} J_{ab}(\omega_0)\hat{\sigma}_+^b\hat{\sigma}_-^a \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

If the environments of A and B are identical, symmetry requires that the appropriate combinations are proportional to $\hat{\sigma}_\pm^A \pm \hat{\sigma}_\pm^B$. One can now see clearly the main point of this paper: in contrast to the Markovian approximation [6], the effective Hamiltonian (generating the coherent evolution of the two qubits) and the Lindblad operators (determining the incoherent decay) are not independent, because they are determined by the *same correlation functions $J_{ab}(\omega)$ of the environment.* It is therefore in general impossible to have one without the other. The ratio between the two, and hence the maximum obtainable figure of merit for the gate, is independent of the coupling strength λ to the environment; instead, it is determined by the spectral characteristics of the environmental fluctuations.

These results are intimately connected to the fluctuation-dissipation theorem [8]. The environment develops a 'response' to the applied 'field' from the first qubit, and it is this response that then drives the second qubit into a state entangled with the first. The change in the expectation value $\langle \hat{O}_B \rangle$ when a classical perturbation $\hat{O}_A$ is applied to the environment is determined the frequency-dependent susceptibility

$$\chi_{BA}(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}\omega' \frac{(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\beta\omega'})J_{BA}(\omega')}{\omega-\omega'}. \quad (18)$$

Note that, since the applied field is classical, χ contains both a positive-frequency and a negative-frequency part, the latter being suppressed by a factor $\mathrm{e}^{-\beta\omega}$. The real and imaginary parts of χ are connected by dispersion relations, and hence the dissipative (imaginary) part of χ is directly connected to the fluctuation spectrum by

$$\Im(\chi_{AB}(\omega)) + \Im(\chi_{BA}(\omega)) = [J_{AB}(\omega)n(\omega) + J_{BA}(-\omega)n(-\omega)]. \quad (19)$$

Here $n(\omega) \equiv [\exp(\beta\omega)-1]^{-1}$ is the Bose occupation number at frequency ω.

In our case, we have to distinguish between positive-frequency (environment transiently absorbs energy from system A or B) and negative-frequency (environment gives out energy) processes. Both contribute to the effective Hamiltonian (16), but each corresponds to a different type of decoherence. There are therefore two separate relations that link the effective Hamiltonian when the system is operated at some given frequency ω to the positive- and negative-frequency incoherent terms at all other frequencies ω':

$$\hat{H}_{s,-s}(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega'}{2\pi} \frac{\left[\sum_\mu L_{\mu,s}^\dagger(\omega')L_{\mu,s}(\omega')\right]}{\omega'-\omega}; \quad s \in \{+,-\}. \quad (20)$$

A bound on the figure of merit for any particular gate can now be obtained by comparing the time needed for the gate operation to be generated by $\hat{H}_{\rm eff}$ with the decoherence times governed by the Lindblad operators.

Discrete spectrum. The opposite limit is that in which the power spectra of the correlation functions vary much more rapidly with frequency than do the functions $\psi_{ss'}(t,\omega)$ and $\phi_{ss'}(t,\omega)$. In particular, if the frequency response of the environment is strictly confined to discrete frequencies Ω_n, we can write

$$J_{ab}(\omega) = \sum_n J_{ab,n}\delta(\omega-\Omega_n), \quad (21)$$

but must keep the full spectral form of the functions ϕ:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{s,-s}(t,\omega) &= \frac{2}{(\omega-s\omega_0)^2}\sin^2[(\omega-s\omega_0)t] \\ &\quad +\mathrm{i}\left[\frac{-t}{\omega-s\omega_0} + \frac{1}{(\omega-s\omega_0)^2}\sin\left(\frac{(\omega-s\omega_0)t}{2}\right)\right]; \\ \phi_{s,s}(t,\omega) &= \frac{-1}{2\omega_0}\left(\frac{1}{\omega-s\omega_0}[\mathrm{e}^{-2\mathrm{i}s\omega_0 t} - \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}(s\omega_0+\omega)t}]\right. \\ &\quad \left. -\frac{1}{\omega+s\omega_0}[\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}(s\omega_0+\omega)t}-1]\right) \\ \psi_{s,-s}(t) &= \frac{4}{(\omega-s\omega_0)^2}\sin^2\left[\frac{(\omega-s\omega_0)t}{2}\right]; \\ \psi_{s,s}(t,\omega) &= \frac{-\mathrm{i}s}{2\omega_0}\left\{\frac{1}{\omega+s\omega_0} - \frac{1}{\omega-s\omega_0}\right\} \\ &\quad \times(\mathrm{e}^{-2\mathrm{i}s\omega_0 t} - \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\omega-s\omega_0)t} - \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}(s\omega_0+\omega)t} + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Evaluating equation (9) for this case, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\hat{\rho}_{AB}^{(2)}(t) &= \sum_{ab}\sum_{s,s'}\lambda^2\sum_n \frac{1}{2\pi}J_{ab,n} \\ &\quad \left[\hat{\sigma}_s^b\hat{\rho}_{AB}(0)\hat{\sigma}_{s'}^a\psi_{s,s'}(t,\Omega_n)\right. \\ &\quad \left. -\left\{\hat{\sigma}_{s'}^a\hat{\sigma}_s^b\hat{\rho}_{AB}(0)\phi_{s,s'}(t,\Omega_n) + \text{h.c.}\right\}\right] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

This also can be written in the form of equation (15), albeit with a time-dependent effective Hamiltonian

$$\mathrm{i}t\hat{H}_{\rm eff} = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_n\sum_{ab}\sum_{ss'}\frac{J_{ab,n}}{2\pi}(\phi_{ss'} - \phi_{-s',-s}^*)\hat{\sigma}_{s'}^a\hat{\sigma}_s^b; \quad (24)$$

and time-dependent effective Lindblad operators:

$$t\sum_{\mu}\left[\hat{L}_{\mu}\hat{\rho}_{AB}\hat{L}_{\mu}^{\dagger}-\frac{1}{2}\{\hat{L}_{\mu}^{\dagger}\hat{L}_{\mu},\hat{\rho}_{AB}\}\right]$$
$$=\sum_{n}\sum_{ab}\sum_{ss'}J_{ab}\psi_{ss'}\left[\hat{\sigma}_{s}^{b}\hat{\rho}_{AB}\hat{\sigma}_{s'}^{a}-\frac{1}{2}\{\hat{\sigma}_{s'}^{a}\hat{\sigma}_{s}^{b},\hat{\rho}_{AB}\}\right] \quad (25)$$

Note we have used the result $\psi_{ss'}=\phi_{ss'}+\phi^{*}_{-s',-s}$. Once again the Hamiltonian and the Lindblads depend on the same correlation functions, although now two possible strategies are apparent that may suppress the relative magnitude of the Lindblads. One is to ensure that the environment contains no frequency Ω_n nearly resonant with the transition frequency ω_0; the dominant terms in the Lindblads then scale as $t^2\mathrm{sinc}^2(\Delta\omega t)$, where $\Delta\omega$ is the frequency interval between the operating frequency ω_0 and the nearest environment frequency Ω_n. A second strategy is to ensure that the gate's operating timescale coincides with the zeros of $\psi_{ss'}(t,\omega)$, so that there is no decoherence following one complete operation cycle (although there may be some at intermediate times). This is only likely to be possible if a single frequency Ω_n dominates the response. Note that this second strategy guarantees a zero contribution to the decoherence from frequency Ω_n, regardless of the magnitude of the fluctuations $J_{ab,n}$. This is how a 'warm' ion vibrational mode is exploited to produce entanglement in an ion trap [9, 10]; our argument shows that this idea is much more general.

Our results may be considered a generalization of the 'fluctuation-dissipation-entanglement theorem' proposed by Sidles *et al.* [11]; these authors, however, considered just the interaction of a single spin with a harmonic bath. The present results confirm their expectation that such connections could be found for arbitrary environments. We also note that particular cases of the fundamental connection between coherent and incoherent evolution have been noticed before, including the Korringa law connecting the relaxation rate to the Knight shift for NMR in metals [12], single-qubit manipulations in quantum optics [7], and limits placed by spontaneous emission on quantum manipulations in ion traps [13].

Unfortunately, the elegant device of the Decoherence Free Subspace (DFS) [14] is of no use in avoiding the type of irreducible decoherence we have described. Using a DFS, we would work entirely with states $|\psi\rangle$ of the two qubits for which

$$\hat{V}_A|\psi\rangle=\hat{V}_B|\psi\rangle=0. \quad (26)$$

However, there would then be no way to entangle the two qubits by the coherent part of the evolution, since $\hat{H}_{\mathrm{eff}}|\psi\rangle=0$. Therefore, the DFS is only useful so long as the dominant source of decoherence is *different* from the environmental response producing the inter-qubit coupling; the DFS can reduce the decoherence from other sources, but not eliminate the irreducible component described here.

Our results suggest several ways to minimize the unavoidable decoherence. Two, described above, involve engineering the frequency spectrum of the environment or carefully choosing the operation time of the gates. Another route might be by preparing special initial 'squeezed' states of the environment, in which the fluctuations in those observables that couple to the qubits are reduced below their equilibrium values (even, in principle, below their zero-temperature values), at the expense of larger fluctuations in other (conjugate) variables that do not couple to the qubits. Application of these ideas to bound the figures of merit for various specific types of inter-qubit coupling will be described in a separate publication. However, it should also be noted that the present results come from a weak-coupling expansion in the interaction between the qubits and the environment; it is entirely possible that very strong interactions in certain systems might lead to a different balance between entanglement and decoherence.

The author would like to thank Marshall Stoneham, Joe Gittings, Thornton Greenland, Steve Cox, Tim Spiller, Bill Munro, Rasmus Hansen, David Pettifor and Martin Plenio for discussions and suggestions. This work was partially supported by the EPSRC under GR/M67865, and partly by the IRC in Nanotechnology.

[1] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
[2] N. Bonadeo, J. Erland, D. Gammon, D. Park, and D. Steel, Science **282**, 1473 (1998).
[3] L. Quiroga and N. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2270 (1999).
[4] D. Cory, A. Fahmy, and T. Havel, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **94**, 1634 (1997).
[5] J. Jones, in *The Physics of Quantum Information*, edited by D. Bouwmeester, A. Ekert, and A. Zeilinger (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000).
[6] G. Lindblad, Commun. Math. Phys. **48**, 199 (1976).
[7] S. van Enk and H. Kimble, quant-ph/0107088.
[8] R. Kubo, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **12**, 570 (1957).
[9] K. Mølmer and A. Sørensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1835 (1999).
[10] C. A. Sackett, D. Kielpinski, B. E. King, C. Langer, V. Meyer, C. J. Myatt, M. Rowe, Q. A. Turchette, W. M. Itano, D. J. Wineland, et al., Nature **404**, 256 (2000).
[11] J. Sidles, J. Garbini, W. Dougherty, and S. Chao, quant-ph/0004106.
[12] C. Slichter, *Principles of Magnetic Resonance* (Springer, Berlin; London, 1990), 3rd ed.
[13] M. Plenio and P. Knight, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **453**, 2017 (1997).
[14] D. Lidar, I. Chuang, and K. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2594 (1998).